

1 THE W LAW FIRM P.L.L.C.

2 David T. Wilkison, Esq.
3 P.O. Box 75
4 Vail, Arizona 85641
5 (520) 647-0531
6 david@thewlawfirm.com
7 State Bar No. 029548

8 Attorney for Defendant

9 **IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA**

10 **IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF COCHISE**

11 STATE OF ARIZONA,)

12 Plaintiff,)

13 vs.)

14 **FAUSTO NAVARRO,**)

15 Defendant.)

No. CR201800212

**MOTION FOR REMAND TO
THE GRAND JURY FOR
REDETERMINATION OF
PROBABLE CAUSE**

Hon. John F. Kelliher Jr.
Div. II

17 The Defendant, FAUSTO NAVARRO, by and through undersigned counsel.
18 respectfully moves this court to remand this matter to the Cochise County Grand Jury for
19 a redetermination of probable cause.

20 -

21 -

22 -

23 -

24 -

25 -

26 -

27 -

28 -

1 This motion is based upon the 5th, 6th and 14th Amendments to the United States
2 Constitution, Article 2 Sections 4, 10, 24 and 30 of the Arizona Constitution, Rule 12 et
3 seq. of the Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure and the attached memorandum of points
4 and authorities which is incorporated herein by this reference.
5

6 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 6 day of April, 2018.
7

8
9 THE W LAW FIRM P.L.L.C.

10
11 
12 David T. Wilkinson, Esq.
13 Attorney for Defendant
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

3

4
5
6
7
8

9

- 10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24

25

26

27
28

II. LAW

Rule 12.9 (a) of the Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure provides:

Grounds. The grand jury proceedings may be challenged only by motion for a new finding of probable cause alleging that the defendant was denied a substantial procedural right, or that an insufficient number of qualified grand jurors concurred in the finding of the indictment.

An accused person is entitled to due process in the grand jury proceedings. *Crimmins v. Superior Court*, 137 Ariz. 39, 668 P.2d 882 (1983); *State v. Emery*, 131 Ariz. 493, 642 P.2d 838 (1982). The due process rights of the accused are protected by the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution and by Article 2 Sections 4, 24, and 30 of the Arizona Constitution. Due process requires that a prosecutor read the applicable statutes to the Grand Jury, provide copies of the statutes for use during deliberation, and ask the Grand Jury whether they would like any of the statutes reread or clarified. *See O'Meara v. Gottsfield*, 174 Ariz. 576, 578, 851 P.2d 1375, 1377 (1993).

Further, "due process . . . requires the use of an unbiased grand jury and a fair and impartial presentation of the evidence." *O'Meara v. Gottsfield*, 174 Ariz. 576, 577, 851 P.2d 1375, 1376 (1993) (*En Banc* citing *Crimmins v. Superior Court*, 137 Ariz. at 41 (1983)); *State v. Emery*, 131 Ariz. at 506. The prosecutor's duty to present evidence to the grand jury in a fair and unbiased manner is very important because of the ex parte nature of the hearing. *O'Meara v. Superior Court*, 173 Ariz. 355, 356, 842 P.2d 1368, 1369 (App. 1992).

III. ARGUMENT

A. The State Violated Mr. Navarro's Due Process Rights to a Fair and Impartial Presentation of the Evidence by Presenting Both Fausto and Hernan's Cases Simultaneously to the Grand Jury.

Here, the State chose to present Fausto Navarro and Hernan Navarro's cases together to the grand jury. This choice to present two cases as one precluded each defendant from having a *fair and unbiased* presentation to the jury. *See Id.* Joinder as co-defendant's in a

1 case is substantially different than joinder in grand jury proceedings because of the *ex*
2 *parte* nature of the hearing. See *Id.*

3 The facts of this case, as presented to the grand jury, were two distinct fact patterns.
4 There are two different alleged victims, with each co-defendant having a different victim.
5 The alleged sexual acts took place in different places, one in a bedroom in the house and
6 the other in a truck outside the house. Even the alleged sexual acts are different in nature,
7 with one being penial/vaginal penetration and the other being finger/vaginal penetration.

8 The State presented the facts in this case by having Detective Ingram describe
9 Hernan's case to the grand jury first, and then describing Fausto's case to the grand jury
10 immediately afterwards. This is improper. By presenting each defendant's case together,
11 instead of individually for two different grand jury proceedings, the grand jury was
12 unable to individually give each defendant a fair and impartial decision-making
13 opportunity for a probable cause determination. See *O'Meara*, 174 Ariz. at 577; *Emery*,
14 131 Ariz. at 506.

15 -

16 -

17 -

18 -

19 -

20 -

21 -

22 -

23 -

24 -

25 -

26 -

27 -


28 -

1 **IV. CONCLUSION**

2 Grand jury proceedings are a primary security to the innocent against hasty,
3 malicious and oppressive persecution. Because of the importance of this initial step in
4 the legal process, nothing can be overlooked when dealing with a defendant's Due
5 Process Rights. Mr. Navarro's Due Process Rights were violated multiple times in his
6 grand jury proceedings as discussed above, and as such a remand for redetermination of
7 probable cause is necessary to ensure no further Constitutional violations occur.
8

9
10 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 6 day of April, 2018.

11
12 THE W LAW FIRM P.L.L.C.

13
14 
15 David T. Wilkison, Esq.
16 Attorney for Defendant

17
18 A Copy of the foregoing
19 Sent/Emailed on April 6, 2018
to the following:

20 The Honorable John F. Kelliher Jr.
21 Cochise County Superior Court
22 100 Quality Hill Rd.
Bisbee, Arizona 85603

23 Michael Powell
24 Deputy County Attorney
25 150 Quality Hill Rd.
Bisbee, Arizona 85603

26 By:

27
28 
David Wilkison, Esq.